

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR.

VOL. 15.--NO. 52.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1860.

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

WHOLE NO. 774.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

[The following extracts are from a recent letter of Gerrit Smith to Frederick Douglass.]

The cause of Temperance is prostrate. Who prostrate it? Its professed friends. How? By trifling with it, and trampling it under foot at the polls. By voting for candidates whom they knew to be in favor of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors for a beverage. No man, who believes in the rightfulness of such sale, is fit for any political office. For the sole legitimate end of every such office is protection of the people; and hence they and they only, who love to be and study to be their protectors, are fit for such office. But are they such protectors, who license the dram-shops, that manufacture not of drunkards and paupers only, but also of madmen, murderers and every other sort of criminal? Certainly not! As well might we elect slaveholders to political office. And how unfit they who buy and sell people are to be entrusted with the protection of the people, does surely not need to be argued. Nevertheless these friends of Temperance, yielding to other interests and partaking of the frenzy of party politics, rush to the polls to vote for drunkards and drunkard-makers. The rum-seller himself is not a more responsible drunkard-maker than he who licenses him. And if here or there an earnest man, whose conscience sternly forbids such prostitution of suffrage, he is scoffed at by these friends of Temperance as a fanatic or a fool. They are ever proclaiming that the dram-shop is the greatest of all curses;—and yet they are ever voting to maintain it. Is this their matchless infatuation or their amazing hypocrisy?

A like treachery explains the like low condition of the anti-slavery cause. Abolitionists have from year to year voted against it, until at last, there are fewer Abolitionists than there have been at any time within twenty years. The mass of those, who were once intent on abolishing slavery everywhere, do not go now for its abolition anywhere. The calculating policy of non-interference has taken the place of the uncompromising principle of abolition.

In the year 1844 more than sixty thousand men voted for James G. Birney. They would have refused to do so, had he not been opposed to the returning of fugitive slaves; to the continuance of slavery in the District of Columbia; to the continuance of the slave trade between the States; and to the admission of slave States. But four years had gone by another spirit had entered into them; and now even Martin Van Buren, with all his pro-slavery line upon him, was fit to be voted for by men, who had so recently consecrated their votes to that repentant slaveholder—that sublimely pure and just man—James G. Birney. Of these sixty thousand probably not one thousand would now demand in their candidate the qualifications which they demanded in 1844. Was not all the sixty thousand would have voted as he did, had Birney avowed himself in favor of a white man's party, or of any however slight discrimination against the black man in the whole multitude of political rights? But now how very few of them all would withhold their votes from their candidate because of such an atheistic avowal on his part? I say atheistic—for what is plainer than that he who makes it does not believe in the God who made of one blood all nations? Very few of the sixty thousand but would now denounce a candidate as foolish or fanatical for placing himself on any of those high grounds on which Birney stood forth so openly and bravely and nobly. Now the sixty thousand call for cunning in their candidate. Then they insisted on integrity. Then the candidate must be grandly moral as well as grandly intellectual in order to be worthy of their votes. Now he must know how to shape his creed to the popular favor, and be skilled in contrivances to get votes. Thus increasingly rapid are the downward steps in morals.

What a mighty host would the sixty thousand have become had they not fallen into the fatal error of giving up truth for numbers! They were impatient for success—not knowing that they already had it, and would continue to have it so long as they adhered to principle. For not only is it true that such adherence works out and surrounds itself with every success, but that it is itself the highest form of success. The sixty thousand had grown from seven thousand in four years.

A far less rate of progress would have put the Government of the country into their hands long ere this time. Evil was the hour in which they listened to the proposal to purchase speedy victory at the price of their principles. The price was paid. But no victory and no good came in return. Thanks for the eternal ordinance that no good can be purchased at such price!

The retrogradation of Northern Legislatures in respect to slavery illustrates the decline of Northern sentiment on that subject.

Vermont is acknowledged to be the most anti-slavery of all the States. But would her present Legislature resolve by even a bare majority in favor of abolishing the inter-State slave trade; or slavery in the District of Columbia; or in favor of refusing the admission of new slave States? The disastrous effect of such Resolutions on the coming election would be an effectual plea against them. Nevertheless in 1838 her Senate voted in favor of all these, and her Assembly by such an overwhelming acclamation, that no negatives were called for.

The only Anti-Slavery to be found in any of the present Parties is an unsteady opposition to the establishment of slavery in a Territory. Occasionally surrendered, it must be also renewed to the end that an apparent, albeit well nigh infinitesimal, difference may be kept up between the Republican and other parties on the question of slavery. A Republican vote needs to hear and say something now and then against Territorial slavery, not only to prevent others from confounding him with a Douglas Democrat, but to preserve the hair's breadth difference in his own consciousness. At every other point than this territorial slavery all the parties allow slavery its full swing. And how inconsistent and vain would be even an earnest and steady opposition to slavery at this point, if accompanied, as the present vacillating opposition is, by the admission that slavery may exist in a State—yes, in every State! For what is slavery but the practically asserted claim of property in man? And if the rightfulness of that claim in a State is conceded, it is virtually conceded in a Territory also. What is property anywhere is property everywhere. That what the laws make property is property is one of the things in the big bundle of atheism. Property makes necessity for laws; but God alone ordains what is property. To the school of great Nature, and not to the enactments and convictions of men, are we to go and learn the elements and subjects of property. That Government may authorize the destruction of property in cases where it has become a source of actual or apprehended evil I do not deny. But I do deny that this admitted power affords, as some maintain, ground for the claim that Government can transmute into property that which is not property, and can look away from the light of nature, common sense, and common law to determine what is property. Perhaps instead of saying that Government may authorize the destruction of property, I had better say that it may authorize the destruction of that in which the rights of property are already forfeited or lost.

Would then any political party consistently and effectually oppose the introduction of slavery into a Territory, it must recall every admission it has made in favor of the lawfulness of slavery in a State. At this point of territorial slavery the Anti-Slavery Democrats have on the score of consistency an immense advantage over the Republicans and Douglasites. If a man may be property in a State, it follows that he can be rightfully carried as property into a Territory. These Democrats make themselves strong by adopting this inference, and their opponents weaken themselves by rejecting it. But these Democrats would make themselves far stronger, if they would push their consistency further, and insist on the right to carry this man property not only into any Territory but into every State also. And they will yet come to this, and bring the nation to this provided the Abolitionists do not succeed in the mean time with their counter doctrine that man is property nowhere. Either Jefferson Davis or Wendell Phillips is right. All between them, be it Mr. Douglas or Lincoln or whoever else, are wrong. If the being, made in the image of God, may be a slave anywhere, he may be a slave everywhere; and if not everywhere, then nowhere. Vice President Breckinridge in his letter of acceptance just now published—a letter by the way evincing of the high order of his cultivated mind—says: "Nothing less than sovereignty can destroy or impair the rights of persons or property." A proposition this, were the words "less than sovereignty" omitted. But a very unsound proposition is it, which sets sovereignty (human laws) above nature and God. The rights of persons and property stand in nature and God; and every invasion of them is sacrilege. The one legitimate function of Civil Government is to protect these rights in all their original fullness and sacredness. But the Vice President is a slaveholder, and in self defense must assert the power of civil government to destroy the rights of persons. So too he must assert its power to destroy the rights of property, and to abolish slavery. For to abolish slavery is, as he holds, to destroy those rights; and he clearly sees that if civil government cannot abolish slavery, then upon his own principle it cannot create it.

The Vice President has made a mistake. The only position at this point on the side of slavery, which he could have taken with consistency, he has failed to take. In one breath he makes property in man to be as full as property in anything else—as property of "whatever kind." In another breath he admits that the State can abolish property in man. What if the State should undertake to abolish property in the matchless blue grass fields around his Lexington, and in the higher improved breeds of cattle, that graze upon them? Would he not resist such abolition? From what I personally know of his spirit and intelligence, I venture to affirm that none would be before him in declaring that God and Nature have said what is property, and that their authority is paramount to that of Kentucky. To have been consistent then he should not have admitted the right of the State to abolish property in man. He has admitted a distinction between slave property and other property; and if not so wide as that the Republicans claim, nor even so wide as that acknowledged by the Douglasites, sufficiently so nevertheless to give countenance to each, and to deprive his opposition to each of the dignity and force of a contest for a principle. The only contest for a principle at this point is that, which the Abolitionists are waging against Republicans, Democrats, Douglasites and all other enemies and despisers of human rights. The sound Abolitionist tolerates in no circumstances the claim of property in man. He respects God, and cannot consent to sink to the level of brutes the being in his image.

Just here let me say that the parties vastly overrate the importance of the petty issues between them. The battle is to be fought between the slaveholders and the Abolitionists; and it will be fought just as soon as these parties, that block the way, get out of the way. The result will be, not this or that condition, this or that liability, of a Territory;—but a Nation all overpowered with slavery, or all emptied of it. The result will be to give the lie to the "Declaration of Independence," or to honor its great doctrine, that "All men are created equal!"

It is true that many members of the Republican party believe slavery to be unconstitutional, wherever the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction. But they all acquiesce in the proposition that this Government has no right to array itself against slavery in the States; and nearly all would accept the logical sequence that this Government is bound to protect State slavery from all foreign aggression. In a word, all the parties believe that the North is pledged by the Constitution, not only to return the fugitive slave, but even to march South for the defence of slavery. Truly, this is being pledged to the perpetration of enormous wickedness! For my own part I do not see

that this pledge exists. But the North does; and hence her only wise and christian course is to entreat the South to liberate her from it either by consenting to change the Constitution at this point, or by consenting to let her, the North, go out of the Union. Surely the people of the South will not insist that we shall continue to trample upon our consciences and kill our souls by contributing to uphold a system, which, however innocent it may be in their eyes, is in our own more full of injustice to man and dishonor to God than any other on earth. Let the South do to the North as in an exchange of circumstances, she would have the North do to the South. What if the Northern States should adopt the policy of enslaving her light-haired people, and the South should then be holding as she does now, in common with the North, to the doctrine of the absolute right of a State, as against the national government, to do what she will with her people!—she would, of course, regard herself as constitutionally bound to uphold this policy. How deeply desirous therefore would she be to be released from all responsibility for it! For she would believe it to be an exceedingly wicked policy. Yet, what more wicked is it to enslave people because of their light hair than because of their dark skin?

I believe the Constitution to be anti-slavery. I believe, that it imposes no obligation upon me to uphold and fight for murder in Maryland or for the worse crime of slavery in Kentucky. But Constitution or no Constitution, I would have the North vote slavery to death. The North however believes the Constitution to be pro-slavery, and that whilst it remains unchanged such voting would be wrong. Again, I would have every slave run away from his master, and I would afford him every facility for his peaceful escape. I would tell him, as I have been telling him these twenty years, to "take the horse, the boat, the food, the clothing; and to believe in no right of property anywhere in the South as against his needs—nor indeed in the North either, so long as it continues to be to him an "enemy's country." Let him take what he will, human life alone excepted. But the North, interpreting the right of the slaveholder to his slave to be a Constitutional right, and holding every Constitutional right to be sacredly inviolable and paramount to every other right whether in earth or heaven, cannot consistently put forth its hand in any way to deliver the slave.

I repeat then that the North, taking her at her own view of her obligations, has no other alternative than to cast herself upon the good feeling of the South, and petition for a change in the Constitution or a peaceful release from the Union. The right of such release—be it the release of the North or the South, the East or the West—I argued in my speech in Congress on the Mexican Treaty. That right I hold to now; and that right I believe the South is just and generous enough to acknowledge. As you are aware, I am as ready to look South as North for justice, generosity and manliness. Do you say that the South is greatly corrupted by slavery? She is; but not more than the North. Slavery is upheld at the South in accordance with education. At the North in the face of education. The South believes it to be morally right to demand the return of fugitive slaves. The North believes it to be morally wrong—Constitutionally right but morally wrong—to return them; and yet returns them. Is not the North then the more wicked—the more corrupted—of the two? Certain it is to my own mind, that the North bears a more corrupting relation to slavery than does the South.

Charles Sumner, that pure and brave and strong and learned man, does in his speech of day before yesterday in New York, distinctly convey the idea that the American Union is no more responsible for slavery in Charleston than in Constantinople. How otherwise could he put himself in line with the Republican party?—especially after having shot so far ahead of it in his recent masterly speech in Congress? But, it is impossible for my noble friend to bring himself into harmony with that party. There is not room enough within its exceedingly narrow limits for a soul so great—to be expanded by the love of truth—as is his. Even were there ground for his comparison between Charleston and Constantinople, he nevertheless could not be of that party. But there is not the slightest ground for it. The Union is not bound to maintain any sort of government in Constantinople. But it is bound to maintain a "republican form of government" in Charleston. It is not bound to put down insurrections in Constantinople. But it is bound to put them down in Charleston. Is slavery incompatible with republicanism, then the Union must put down slavery everywhere where within the Union—and so must it do if slavery has been or is to be the source of insurrection in any of the States. It must not permit the safety of a State, and through a State, the safety of the Union to be thus endangered by the existence of slavery.

Does Mr. Sumner admit the Constitution tolerates slavery in the States?—Then does he virtually admit that the whole nation is bound to defend it, in certain contingencies, to fight for it. Or does he deny that it is in the contemplation of the Constitution, that a State may so outrage all just conceptions of a "republican form of government," as to set up or continue slavery; or may furnish those frightful materials for domestic violence in which slavery abounds, then also does he virtually admit that the whole nation is responsible for it—as responsible under the Constitution to abolish it, as in the former case it was responsible under the Constitution to maintain it.

Would that my dear friend might disembarrass himself of the few remaining hindrances in his glorious service of the cause of freedom, and hasten to plant himself by the side of William Goodell, Lyander Spooner and those other radical Abolitionists, who hold that the whole nation is bound to shut out slavery from the whole nation because the Constitution does so!

I have spoken of the duty of the North in the light of the convictions and admissions of the North. I hardly need say that I shall myself continue to go to the polls with a vote for men, who are not only anti-dram-shop men, but who, knowing no law for slavery, treat as nullities whatever Courts, Constitutions or Legislatures may say in

favor of it. My vote must continue to be for men who are content with and obedient to the law of heaven in respect to slavery. Increasingly disgusted as I am with the east of the churches about christianity, I have no knowledge of Christ if it is possible that, in any circumstances, votes for run-away or slavery-men can serve his cause or do him honor. I should be glad to vote at the coming election for the names presented by a Temperance and Abolition Convention. But if there are not enough earnest Temperance men and Abolitionists left to get it up, I will endeavor to compose my ticket without the help of a Convention.

I trust that the stress, which I lay on voting, will not be construed to imply a censure of Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips and their noble associates, for all honor, as I always have done, the men who, differing broadly from myself in their interpretation of the Constitution, have conscience against voting under it.

Should any one of the five Presidential candidates be elected, and I should see him applying his official powers to give back his brothers and sisters to the horrors and hell of slavery, I should be distressed. But had I voted for him, I should die of remorse. For I should feel that his superlatively guilty work was my work—I having made it such in advance by my vote to give him the office, which I well knew he stood ready to use for this most diabolical purpose. In that case the summons of the President for military or naval aid to the kidnappers would be my summons, and the guilt of it would crimson my soul as well as his. For the stripes and tortures that would await the returning captives, I, as well as he, would be responsible. Responsible I as well as he, for their doom of a compelled and unrequited life-long toil. And the thought, that they were no more to have a right to husband or wife; parent or child; and no more to be permitted to read the Bible or spell the name of Jesus would be the ever-creeping thought, that to this possible and even probable end did I cast my vote, when I cast it for one whom I knew to be in favor of consigning them to this fate. No, I must not vote for such a one. If others with their views can, I with my views cannot. If there are others who can afford to be stock of righteousness—as so large, that a balance would be left them even after voting (as does every voter for a slave catching Presidential candidate) to set the whole army and navy of the United States against the innocent fugitive. But I have no such surplus goodness to vote upon; and therefore for me to cast such an unrighteous vote would be to reduce myself to utter and immediate moral insolvency.

Christian! were Jesus again on earth, would you vote to have him lead the forces for returning the poor slave to the disabilities and tortures from which he had escaped? The bare proposition is most abhorrent to you. How then can you consent to vote for Mr. Douglas, or Mr. Lincoln, or any other man, who virtually tells you that he is willing to lead them? Has not party spirit blinded you? Nay, has it not corrupted you? What is too abominable for Christ to do is to be abominable for any man to do; and thus would you yourself decide in every case where the spirit of Christ and not the spirit of party prompted the decision. I said that I must not vote for a slave catcher. My profession of deep and tender interest in the slave is a life-long one. To turn now and vote against him—to vote that if he escape from chattelhood to manhood, he shall be thrown down again from manhood to chattelhood—would not that be giving an emphatic lie to this profession? Again, when men get to be as old as I am, they have an especial reason for not adding to the number of their sins—particularly of their great sins. Their "space for repentance" is reduced to a narrow one—too narrow to supply all the penitential tears, which even one such enormous sin, as voting a man back into slavery, calls for.

But I am asked whether I would withhold my vote from a candidate because I foresee one official wrong in him, and yet feel assured that he will be guilty of no other. Certainly, if that wrong is the murdering, or what is worse, the enslaving of his fellow men. The wrong done to one man is not concealed by right dealing toward even all other men. Moreover, I am not at liberty to feel assured, that he who is pledged to commit the most flagrant injustice against one man will not, when as strong temptation falls for it, be guilty of as flagrant injustice toward other men.

Don't complain, gentlemen. You have always been treated thus by the South, who, finding that you bear it with a good degree of endurance, and while smiting from the blow, bless the hand that wields the rod, and shout "God save this glorious Union!" will be very apt to continue the application.

From the Cleveland Leader.

PRO-SLAVERY WAR ON LIBERTY POLES!

The intolerance of pro-slavery Democracy has been freshly illustrated in Washington City and vicinity. The Republicans of the Capital of the Republic sought permission to erect a Liberty Pole in the District of Columbia, but even that poor privilege of freemen was insolently denied them.

On the 4th of July the Republicans of Occoquan, a village in Prince William county, near Alexandria, Virginia, showed their independence by assembling to the number of about sixty, and raising a Liberty Pole, from which the national banner was unfurled, and also a party ensign bearing the names of Lincoln and Hamilton. A celebration was held, and several speeches were made endorsing the Chicago platform. Among the speakers were John Underwood and Wm. Atchaf. This roused the pro-slavery chivalry. George Potter, a commissioned captain in the 60th regiment Virginia militia, at once wrote to Adjutant General Richardson, at Richmond, informing him that "the people in the adjacent neighborhood desire to know if such a flag put up in the heart of a Southern State ought not to be pulled down"—and that the people here [Alexandria] looked upon this as a bold abolition step, and are anxious this pole and flag should be demolished." The gallant Capt.

Potter reminds his superior that he is subject to orders; and says "I hope to hear from you at an early day."

The letter was received July 23d and immediately laid before Gov. Letcher, and Adjutant General Richardson wrote the same day to the valorous Capt. Potter that—"If the people of the vicinity choose to tolerate such an outrage the Governor has no official control over the matter." On the 24th, Mr. Atchaf, on behalf of the citizens of Occoquan, telegraphed to Gov. Letcher asking protection from a threatened mob of 300 men from a distant part of the county. The Governor made some feeble show of using the civil authority to preserve the peace, but the Richmond Inquirer pronounced the dispatch the most consummate piece of impudence and audacity that had ever come under its notice; and a meeting was held at Brentsville, Prince William county, for the purpose of organizing a company to proceed to Occoquan and haul down the obnoxious flag raised by a set of treasonable fanatics."

How the "obnoxious flag and treasonable fanatics" were maltreated by the Virginia chivalry, is thus related by the Alexandria Gazette, a pro-slavery journal. It says:

On the morning of the 25th (yesterday) the Republicans hoisted the American flag and the party ensign, bearing the names of Lincoln and Hamilton. At 5 o'clock the Prince William Cavalry, Capt. Thornton commanding, entered the village, and ranged themselves in the neighborhood of the pole. They were followed by a company of about fifty strong, under command of Captain Fitzhugh and Major Carter, who paying no attention whatever to the horsemen, quietly formed in a hollow square around the pole, facing inward. While this company was surrounding the pole, Mr. Joseph T. Jany advanced to the captain of the troop of horse and claimed protection for his property, upon which the pole stood.

At the word of command, James W. Jackson, a stalwart yeoman, sprang forward and gave the first blow. Others followed, redoubling stroke on stroke. During the time there was no interruption, save the Republicans and others, who stood at corners near by, would cry out, "Ain't your ax dull? Hope you're having a good time." In a few minutes, however, there was a cry of "Stand from under!" and the pole came to the ground. Instantly the crowd gave three cheers, when the Republicans responded by "Three cheers for Hamilton." At were quickly at work on the fallen pole, and in less time than it takes to tell it was chopped up and the pieces carried off. The flag was sent to Brentsville.

As soon as the flag-pole was leveled, Capt. Fitzhugh ordered "about face," and his company marched off, saluted as they went by with mingled jeers and applause. During the evening there was some excitement, and a personal encounter to place between Col. Brawner and Joseph T. Jany, in which the latter was considerably injured. The crowd cleared away during the evening, and at sundown all was quiet.

The Republicans say they will put up another pole on the same site.

A dispatch from Washington dated the 28th, says:

"A report reached here to night, through parties who were at Occoquan yesterday, that the greatest excitement prevailed at that place when they left; that several Republicans had been attacked, and several fights resulted. One statement is that Mr. Jany, a Bell and Everett man—an old settler in Virginia, a large property holder, and the owner of the land where the liberty pole was erected—was brutally assaulted and beaten because he asserted that he had the right to declare his own principles upon his own homestead, and to permit others to exercise their rights within his own grounds, if it pleased him to do so."

From the New York Tribune.

EMANCIPATION BY A VIRGINIAN.

Mrs. Cornelia Barbour, a daughter of the Hon. James Barbour of Virginia, formerly Governor of that State, and a member of President J. Q. Adams' Cabinet, has resolved to emancipate her numerous slaves and locate them in a free State, where they can enjoy liberty and (if they will) acquire property. The following letter was prompted by tidings of this resolution:

New York, July 9, 1860.

Mrs. CORNELIA BARBOUR.—It was my happiness many years ago to pass a portion of two days at the house and in the society of your honored father in Orange County, in the Old Dominion. I still cherish a very distinct recollection of him, your mother, and yourself, and of the pleasure and instruction I derived from that visit. Recent information that you, in concurrence with the sentiments of the great men of Virginia at the period of the Revolution, of the great and good men of all Christian countries, except only our Southern States, had resolved to give freedom to your bondmen, has awakened anew the memory of that interview, for which I was indebted to the kind introduction of our mutual friend, Judge Field of Culpepper. Allow me to rejoice and to thank you for your practical devotion and self-sacrifice in a cause now doubly dear to me, since it has cost me years of exile and banishment from all the fond ties of wife and children, and a happy home. In my wanderings since my ostracism from our great State of Virginia in 1856, I have often dwelt with delight on the recollections of the noble person and the still nobler sentiments of your distinguished father. These feelings are aroused with increased intensity by an extract inclosed, which I have just sent from the New York Tribune of this day's date. Such sentiments are worthy of one of the great lights of our country—a man who conferred honor upon every station he occupied, whether in the Executive of his native State, in the Cabinet of one of the purest National Administrations, or as our Representative at the most mighty Court of Europe.

Go on, esteemed daughter of Virginia and of a most noble sire, in the work of patriotism, of freedom and humanity! Others shall be influenced by your bright and heroic example. And may we not hope for the speedy coming of that good time when the State we love shall resume her ancient position, the foremost among her sisters of this

glorious Union! Her central location, her unequalled natural resources and capabilities, demand this at her hands. She should be first in agriculture, in commerce, in arts, in manufactures, and especially in intellectual culture, and in all the higher developments of mind and heart which give elevation of purpose and dignity of character, and spread the kind charities and sweet amenities of Christian civilization through all the activities of social and domestic life.

I know you will have the earnest sympathizer in the person of my wife, who, like yourself, born to a condition of ease and indulgence amid large circles of servants, has, like yourself, chosen to secure the consciousness of doing justice and loving mercy, at the expense of incurring the reproach of folly and fanaticism. The names of those equal to the surrender of arbitrary power are few indeed, and worthy of eternal consecration. Who can forget Disraeli, Charles Y. Richard Cromwell, La Fayette, or the Russian Alexander II., who has already achieved greater glory by the emancipation of his serfs than did his Greek predecessor by the subjugation of the world.—Yours shall be a kindred glory. God grant that you may be spared the cruel persecutions, spite, threats and denunciations which my poor wife has been compelled to endure. Through the medium of that good wife, in her premature and enforced widowhood at Culpepper, I send these brief words, assuring you of the sincere respect and great regard with which I remain, your friend,

JOHN C. UNDERWOOD.

THE FUND FOR THE JOHN BROWN FAMILY—HOW IT WAS DISTRIBUTED.

THADDEUS HYATT publishes an account of his distribution of the John Brown Fund, or money raised by sympathizers with John Brown for distribution among his family. Thaddeus says:

"On being released from prison and learning that all the members of the John Brown family would be present at North Elba on the 4th of the present month, I went there. Having, upon the ground, informed myself of the condition of each branch of the family, I proceeded to Boston before making a distribution, in order to act in concert with those there who also had a fund derived from the sale of Mr. Redpath's Life of Capt. John Brown, and from contributions paid to Wendell Phillips, and other friends, including my photograph fund of \$2,600. The total amount thus far raised for the family in this country, is only \$6,150. The Haytian fund will probably be much less than this. I hope therefore, that the sympathizing gentlemen through this country who are mailing to the widow of Capt. Brown letters and photographs of their interesting faces, with offers to borrow sums of a thousand and downward, will cease tormenting their imaginations with inflammatory pictures of bags of gold! The widow has no money to loan! Let this suffice. The \$6,150 has been divided as follows:

To the widow of Capt. Brown and her three children \$2,250
To John Brown, Jr. 1,000
To Isabella, widow of Watson Brown 800
To Mary Ann, widow of William Thompson 550
To Owen Brown 400
To Jacob Brown 300
To Salmon Brown 200
To Ruth, eldest daughter of Capt. Brown, and wife of Henry Thompson 200
To certain of the other sufferers, colored 350
To Barclay Coppie, one of the escaped 50
Amount held by Boston Committee for contingent expenses 100
Total \$6,150
My friend Judge Army, of Kansas, accompanied me to North Elba, and after getting a knowledge of the condition of the different members of the family, he proceeded to New York, and drew the gold, while I went to Boston, where we again met, and returned to North Elba, distributing the gold as follows:

To John Brown, Jr. \$900 00
To Mary, widow of Wm. Thompson 300 00
To Owen Brown 300 00
To Jacob Brown 300 00
To Mrs. Mary Ann, widow of Cap. Brown 200 00
To Salmon Brown 200 00
To Ruth Thompson 200 00
To Isabella, widow of Watson Brown 100 00
To two of the escaped 100 00
Total \$2,600 00
The sum of \$1,450 00 had been previously received by the widow of Capt. Brown and other members of the family. The balance remains in the hands of the Boston Committee, subject to the call of those to whom it belongs.

ABDUCTION OF "TOM."—Augusta, July 18.—The blind negro boy "Tom," (the great pianist) who has been on a concerting tour, under charge of his owner, Mr. Oliver, of Savannah, Ga., has suddenly and mysteriously disappeared. It is believed that he has been abducted by the abolitionists. [The telegraph does not inform us where the abduction occurred. It certainly did not occur at Augusta. On examining our exchanges, however, we find that "Tom" was advertised to perform at a concert in Baltimore, on the night of the 27th inst. Now, as there is a pretty fair sprinkling of abolitionists in that neighborhood, we incline to the belief that some of these miscreants have abducted the musical darkey, and sent him off (by the underground railroad, perhaps,) to Canada, or at least, beyond the reach of his owner.]—Els. Courier.

SOME fourteen or fifteen negro slaves have made their escape from here to free soil during the last day or two. This is one of the natural and inevitable consequences of the Lincoln and Douglas speeches made here recently. The people of Kentucky will yet find that every Lincoln or Douglas speech made within their borders will cost them a negro—rather expensive, as all must admit.—Louisville Courier, July 27th.

Democrat report accusations from the Republican ranks, and Republicans from the Democratic ranks.